



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*Complete Induction for the Identification of the Vocabulary
in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament with its
Semitic Equivalents: Its Necessity and the Means of
obtaining it.*—By MAX L. MARGOLIS, Philadelphia, Pa.

(NB. The sigla for the Septuagint codd. are, in the book of Genesis, those of the larger Cambridge edition; for the other books, those of Swete's manual edition or those used in his *Introduction*; the figures refer to manuscripts in the edition of Holmes-Parsons. Λ = Lucian. The abbreviations of the Biblical books are for the most part the same as in the Oxford Concordance.)

THE first of the canons laid down by the **The first Lagar-**
noted Septuagint scholar LAGARDE requires on **dian Canon**
the part of the student who aims at recovering the original
text of the Greek translation of the Old Testament, a "know-
ledge of the style of the individual translators," with which
is coupled a "faculty of referring variant readings to their
Semitic original, or else of recognizing them as inner-Greek
corruptions." It is obvious that LAGARDE has reference merely
to the material side of the task and ignores the formal
questions of orthography and grammar altogether. It is a
matter with which the future editor will have to grapple,
whether, for example, he should admit forms with anaptyxis,
as ἀγανρίαμα, ἀγανριᾶν, -ᾱσθαι.¹ He will have to choose between
ἦγαν and ἦγον², ἡγάγισαν and ἡγαγον³, συνῆξε and συνήγαγε⁴, φάγη
and φάγεσαι⁵, ἐργᾶ and ἐργάση⁶, διανοιχθήσονται and διανοιγίσονται⁷.
With a view to all such questions the editor will have to study
the grammatical evidence presented by the papyri and other

¹ ἀγανρίαμα is found Jb 4¹⁰ 253; 13¹² B* C. 160. 161. 250. 252. 253. Compl.; Is 62⁷ AB⁸ c. b Q. 22. 51. 86. 87. 91. 93. 97. 109^{ms}. 147. 233. 302^{ms}. 306. 309. Compl.; Je 31(48)² AB⁸. 239; Ba 4³⁴ omn exc 49. 51. 62. 88. 90. 231. Compl. Ald. (106 reads αγαλλιαμα); Ju 10⁸ 74; ἀγανριᾶν, -ᾱσθαι Jb 3¹⁴ AB⁸ C. 55. 106. 137. 139. 250. 252. 258; 39²¹ 160. 252. 253; ibid. ²³ 160. 252. 253. See DIETERICH, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache, p. 33 sqq. ² II K 6³ ηγον AN. A. alii.

³ I Es 1¹⁹ -ον AN. 58. 64. 119. 243. 248. Ald., -οσαν rell.

⁴ Jd 11²⁰ συνῆξε BM. 16. 52. 57-59. 63. 77. 85. 107. 120. 131. 144. 209. 236. 237. ⁵ Ge 3¹⁸ φαγεσαι r. ⁶ Ge 4¹² εργαση 1^a? Phil-codd.

⁷ Ge 3⁵ διανοιγίσονται m.

contemporaneous literature in order to determine the linguistic forms with which the translators may be credited. In this sense the way has been paved by HELBING's "Grammatik der Septuaginta"¹ which, however, ignores the cursives entirely. There will be also questions of internal Greek syntax on which the Semitic original has no bearing.

is really a rule for identifying the Greek with the Semitic. What LAGARDE really means by the original text of the Septuagint is that text which, from among the conflicting forms it has assumed in the history of its transmission, conforms to the Semitic original underlying the translations ("die Vorlage") and to the conception of its meaning on the part of the translators (their exegesis). The First Lagardian Canon is thus a rule for identifying the Greek with the Semitic, the Greek text, buried at present in a mass of variants, with the great unknown quantity, the "Vorlage," with which the prototype of the received Masoretic text was by no means wholly identical. After an elimination of the irrational element of chance corruptions or of the disfiguring element of conscious alteration (diaskeuastic corrections and interpolations), there remains the stupendous task of retroversion for which indeed a knowledge of the style of each individual translator is an all-important prerequisite. The pitfalls are many, not the least

Retroversion being mechanical haste. LAGARDE himself was must not be a sinner in that direction. Following the lead mechanical. of Le 26¹³, he referred *μετὰ παρησίας* = *openly, publicly* (comp. Talmudic בפרהסיא) Pr 10¹⁰ back to קוממיית. He forgot that he was dealing with a translation which aims at elegance rather than at literal accuracy, as well as the fact that the rendering in Le is equally free. קוממיית means properly *with head erect*; one can be made to walk with head erect, but one cannot reprove a friend with head erect. It is a question of Hebrew idiom pure and simple. The Hebrew phrase underlying *μετὰ παρησίας* Pr 10¹⁰ remains an unknown quantity.

Retroversion unscientific is passages wanting in the Hebrew. The phrase occurs, for instance, also I Ma 4¹⁸: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα λάβετε σκύλα καὶ (>SV. Sixt.) *μετὰ παρησίας*. Who will attempt to render it into Hebrew? As a matter of fact, in passages wanting in the Hebrew, all attempts at retroversion are un-

¹ Göttingen 1907.

scientific. Take, for example, the plus Le 10⁹: ἡ προσπορευομένων ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον. Ryssel (in Kittel's Bible) renders: או בקרבכם המזבחה (comp. Ex 40³²); but או בגשתכם אל המזבחה (comp. Ex 28⁴³ 30²⁰) is just as possible. Not even the particle is certain; for, though או will suggest itself first, ו is quite as correct (comp. Ex 38²⁷ (40³²)).¹

It may be even laid down as a canon that *Certainty of identification is possible only when the translator has misread or misinterpreted the original.* Just as complete identity is often a less reliable criterion of the affinity of languages than differentiations of sound regulated by law, so it is only through variation, provided it is psychologically explainable, that we may with certainty arrive at the true text underlying a translation. Thus ἀγομένους Is 60¹¹ corresponds to נְהוֹנִים; but מְוִקְלִים or לְקִיחִים or (if the sense be "led as captives") מְנָלִים would be possible equivalents, and we cannot say with absolute certainty that our text was read by the translator. But ἀγόμεναι La 1⁴ to which נִגְזָוֶת corresponds in the Hebrew, points *with necessity* to נְהוֹנֶת as its equivalent, and to nothing else; for both נִגְזָוֶת and נְהוֹנֶת = נִגְזָוֶת² are reducible to one and the same consonantal text.

Not merely a "knowledge of the style of the individual translators" leads to correct identification, but equally a knowledge of the style of the individual Hebrew writers. Otherwise anachronism ensues. When Kittel (in his Bible) puts down συνήχθησαν δὲ Ge 37³⁵ = וַיִּקְהָלוּ as a variant for וַיִּקְמוּ, he not only misconceives the paraphrastic character of the translation (hence also the free addition καὶ ἱλθον), but, which is less pardonable, burdens the Jahvist with an expression which occurs but once in E (Ex 32¹), and is elsewhere in the Hexateuch confined to P.

¹ The proportion of ו to או for Greek ἡ is 163 : 251 in the Septuagint, 2 : 3 in Aquila, 5 : 4 in Symm., 1 : 4 in Theod., 3 : 8 in AL., 0 : 1 in HEBR.

² In accordance with a well-known orthographic rule; see WELLHAUSEN, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, pp. v-vii. Comp. Ex 15²² וַיִּצְאוּ 6 (וַיִּצְאוּ) / וַיִּצְאוּ 7 (וַיִּצְאוּ) / וַיִּצְאוּ 8 (וַיִּצְאוּ) / וַיִּצְאוּ 9 (וַיִּצְאוּ).

The "units" of individual translations still to be determined.

It is furthermore gratuitous to assume that each of the Biblical books was rendered by a new and "individual" translator. Prologues, as in the case of Ecclesiasticus, and colophons, as at the end of Job or Esther, are rare; for the most part we are left to internal evidence to determine the limits of a "unit" of translation. The "higher criticism" of the Greek version is in its very beginnings. We may assume, for example, that the Twelve are the work of one translator; the question is, how much more? A singular rendering like *συνάγειν* for Hebrew *קָבַץ* (suggested by *קָבַץ* *συνάγεσθαι* Ge 1⁹ Je 3¹⁷ and *קָבַץ* *συναγωγή* Ge 1¹⁰) which meets us Mi 5⁷⁽⁶⁾ 1 occurs again twice in Je 8¹⁵ 2 and 27 (50)^{7,3}. It would be reasonable to ascribe both Jeremiah and the Twelve to one and the same translator, provided of course a sufficient number of similar criteria were available.

The method of

In order, however, to discover the total sum of criteria, the student must obviously collect his data from the *whole* of the Greek Old Testament, whereupon he may proceed to distribute them among the various groups of translators thus brought to light. The right method would be first to ascertain the attitude of the general sum of translators towards all of the phenomena which go to make up a translator's style; on the basis of similarity or dissimilarity of "reaction," the idiosyncracies of the individual translators will reveal themselves. For a translator's style is the total sum of "reactions," of the ways in which the original is handled by him in the various provinces of grammar, rhetoric, semantics, and exegesis.

Illustrations:

Take, for example, the use of the historical present (with *δέ* or preceding *καί*) to express

The Historical Present.

the Hebrew *consecutivum cum imperfecto*. Examples are frequent in K⁴; there is just one example in Jd.⁵ How far the usage extends beyond the books just mentioned, remains to be investigated. It is clear that, in order to establish the interrelation of various books, the student must go through the entire Old Testament in Greek.

¹ *ל* was apparently taken as *nota accusativi*; passivum pro activo?

² Activum pro passivo. ³ *לְמַקְנָה / לְמַקְנָה*?

⁴ E. g., I K 5^{8.11} 7¹ bis 10²¹ 13⁵ 17¹ bis 30¹¹ III K 18⁴⁰. ⁵ 1⁷.

Or take the criterion of "subordination in the place of coordination." The following types are met with:

- (a) καὶ λαβοῦσα ἔφαγεν ותקח ותאכל (e. g. Ge 3⁶ 4¹ 41^{14 bis});
 (b) καὶ ταχύναντες καταγάγετε ומהרתם והורדתם (e. g., Ge 45¹³ De 23¹³⁽¹⁴⁾ 30³);
 (c) εἰσαγαγὼν καταφύτευσον αὐτούς תבאמו ותמעמו (e. g., Ex 15¹⁷ Jb 39²¹);
 (d) ἐπαγαγὼν ἐξαναλώσω σε אעלה וכליתך (e. g., Ex 33^{5 1});
 (e) καὶ ἐνετείλατο φαγεῖν תאכל . . . ויצו (e. g., Ge 2^{16 2 3 17 3 43 16 4} Ex 6^{26 5} Nu 21^{16 6} IK 14^{18 7}; *ibid.* 34⁸).

Or, "the generic singular for the Semitic plural"; e. g., Si 4¹² ὁ ἀγαπῶν αὐτὴν ἀγαπᾷ / Singular.
 47²² τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος αὐτόν / (אזהב) אהבו.

Or, conversely, "the plural for the generic singular in Semitic;" e. g., Ge 4²⁰ τῶν κατοικούντων / ישב; Ne 12¹⁴ καὶ⁹ τοῖς συνηγμένοις (apparently neuter plural) ἐν αὐτοῖς (sc. ἐν τοῖς γαστροφυλακίοις) ἄρχουσιν τῶν πόλεων = לְכֻנּוּם בָּהֶם לְשָׂרֵי הָעָרִים / לשְׂרֵי הערים; Pr 11¹⁰ Σ ἀγαλλιάσονται πόλεις / תעליץ קריה; Is 1²³ ἀγαπῶντες δῶρα¹⁰ / רָלוּ אהב שחר; 13¹⁵ οἵτινες¹¹ συνηγμένοι εἰσιν / כל הנספה¹².

Or, "participial construction in the place of a finite verb in relative clauses;" e. g. Ex 20² ὁ ἐξαγαγὼν σε¹³ ἔξαγαγὼν αὐτούς / אשר הוצאתי אתם; Ru 4¹⁵ ἡ ἀγαπήσασά σε / אשר אהבתך and elsewhere.

Or, conversely, "a relative clause in the place of a Semitic participle;" e. g. I Es 5⁶⁹ (Ezr 4²) ὃς μετήγαγεν (var. μετώκισεν) / המעלה; Is 41⁸ ὃν ἠγάπησά = אֶהְבֵּי / אֶהְבֵּי; and elsewhere.

¹ 15. 55. 73. 78. Lucif.

² 9.

³ omn exc n.

⁴ A.

⁵ omn exc 75.

⁶ 55.

⁷ 245.

⁸ omn exc A.

⁹ The translator took לְכֻנּוּם וּנְ as a general expression summing up the preceding particulars; in such cases, the Hebrew may and may not prefix the conjunction which the translator is free to express if he so chooses; comp. De 15²¹ רַע אִי עוֹר כָּל מוֹם רַע חֻלּוֹן הִי תִּפְלֹן, הִי (var. הִי καὶ καὶ) πᾶς μῶμος πονηρός AF. alii.

¹⁰ But πας τις αγαπα Qmg.

¹¹ οἱ 106 ὅσοι A.

¹² ספה as an equivalent of אספּ also De 32³³ (unless = אֶסְפֶּה / אֶסְפֶּה) and Is 29¹; Je 7²² (unless אספו = an abbreviated אספו, comp. Arabic and Aramaic imperatives of אָפַּי verbs).

¹³ AF alii.

Complete Induction prevents individualizing what is general From an imperfect collation like the preceding it becomes evident that (1) a phenomenon may indeed be characteristic of certain groups only; (2) when a phenomenon is scattered over a wide area (possibly the entire area), it ceases to be a mark of individual style, but becomes a general characteristic of translation from Semitic into Greek; (3) certain manuscripts or groups of manuscripts (= recensions) show a predilection for a certain stylistic peculiarity. Thus I find that Lucian frequently substitutes the aorist for the historical present.¹ But such results are conclusive only when complete induction is available; otherwise the student runs the risk of individualizing what is general.

and renders identification possible. Many identifications, uncertain at the first blush, become incontrovertible when supported by further evidence which the complete induction alone will bring to light. That *παραχρῆμα*, = *on the spot*, is the equivalent of תַּחְתָּהּ, תַּחְתָּם II K 3¹² Jb 40⁷⁽¹²⁾, a matter of doubt for the editors of the Oxford Concordance, is corroborated by Ps 65 (66)¹⁷ Σ (= תַּחְתָּהּ / תַּחַת). || We are safe in identifying ἔδωκαν φυλάσσειν Je 43 (36)²⁰ with הִפְקְדוּ, if we compare πεφυλαγμένοι = לְפָקְדוֹן Ge 41³⁶. || Si 44¹ ἀνδρας ἐνδόξους for אַנְשֵׁי חֹסֶד ceases to be strange when δόξα = חֹסֶד Is 40⁶ is compared. || Ec 2²⁶ τοῦ προσθεῖναι = לִסְף (לְהוֹסִיף) / לְאִסְף (לְאַסְף), just as Le 19²⁵ ΑΛ. καὶ συνάξετε = לְאַסְף / לְהוֹסִיף. || When it is remembered that in 99 instances ἀνάγειν is employed for הִעֲלָה, it will not be difficult to identify καὶ ἐπαναγόντων Za 4¹² with וְהַמְעֲלִים / מְעַלְיָהֶם. || Ps 15 (16)⁴ συναγάγω τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν must certainly be reduced to אֶפְסִיף נִסְבִּיָּהֶם / אֶכְנֶם נִסְבִּיָּהֶם, which proves that in the archetype אֶסִּיף was written אֶנְסִיף, that is, with the נ expressed, though perhaps “assimilated” in pronunciation. The evidence is afforded by the knowledge that συναγειν = כָּנַס in 11 cases. || The last two examples are illustrations of transposition for which other instances are available. Thus Na 2³⁽⁴⁾ ἐμπαίζοντας = מְתַלְעִים / מְתַעֲלָלִים; comp. ἐμπαίζειν = הִתְעַלְלַל Ex 10² Nu 22²⁹ Jd 19²⁵ I K 6⁶ 31⁴ I Ch 10⁴, ἐμπαίγματα = תַּעֲלִילִים Is 66⁴, ἐμπαίχεται = do. ibid. 3⁴. || Is 35² καὶ ὁ λαός μου = וְיִשְׂרָאֵל / וְהַיְּשָׁרִים, just as Ps 28 (29)⁶ καὶ ὁ ἡγαπημένος = וְיִשְׂרָאֵל / וְיִשְׁרָאֵל. While the latter identification

¹ E. g., Jd 1⁷ I K 10²¹ 17² III K 18⁴⁰.

is supported directly by De 32¹⁵ 33⁵⁻²⁶ Is 44², we may cite in substantiation of the former, examples like Ex 17⁵ Jo 7^{11. 1 16. 24 2 10 29 3} where ὁ λαός = **ישראל**, or Jd 20²⁵ where ὁ λαός⁴ = **בני ישראל**, or Mi 2¹² where ὁ λαός οἶτος⁵ or ὁ λαός⁶ = **ישראל**, or Si 45¹⁶ where ὁ λαός σου⁷ = **בני ישראל**, also Je 43 (36)⁶ where ὁ λαός⁸ and Si 48¹⁵ where ὁ λαός⁹ = **יהודה**. Instructive is also Ps 55 (56)¹¹ where ὁ λαός corresponds to **כנסת ישראל ליונה** (and parallels): **אימתילה**, “the Community of Israel is likened unto a dove”. || Only through the juxtaposition of the total number of passages¹⁰ where εὐλαβεῖσθαι τινα or ἀπό τινος = **ב חסה** was it possible for Prof. NESTLE¹¹ to identify καὶ εὐλαβουμένους τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ma 3¹⁶ with **וְלִחְשִׁי בְשֵׁמוֹ** in the place of our **וְלִחְשִׁי שְׁמוֹ** and thus to bring to light a reading which is unquestionably the original. He acknowledges his indebtedness to my article “ΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΙΝ (including Derivatives and Compounds) and its Hebrew-Aramaic Equivalents” which appeared in the AJSL., XXII (1906), 110ff., closing with a confirmation of my own statement that we may obtain through just such work as I am planning, “in the place of the brilliant, but uncertain, guesses, results which may be predicted with almost mathematical accuracy.”

Results which are equally certain are afforded **It equally leads to** by a possession of the complete material when **the recognition** we turn to inner-Greek corruptions. A few **of inner-Greek** examples will not be amiss: **corruptions.**

III K 8⁴⁶ καὶ επαῖξεις αὐτοὺς Sixt. (= B. 92. 120. 158. 247) / **בם ואנפת** has been recognized as faulty. Mr. Burney emends καὶ ἐπάξει αὐτοῖς¹²; he compares Ps 7¹², where ὀργὴν ἐπάγων = **וְעָם**, and Is 26²¹ ἐπάγει τὴν ὀργὴν / **לפֶקֶד עוֹן**; he should have added ibid. 42²⁵ καὶ ἐπήγαγεν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ὀργὴν / **וַיִּשְׁפֹּךְ עֲלֵיו חֲמָה** and Si 5⁸ ἐπαγωγὴ = **עברה**. But he fails to account for the “alteration” in the parallel passage II Ch 6³⁶ καὶ παταῖξεις αὐτοὺς¹³ for which no variant reading is available. Nevertheless,

¹ Omn exc 54. 75. ² BM. 29. 30. 59. 63. 64. 72. 77. 85^{mg.}

³ A. 16. 52. 77.

⁴ AGA. alii.

⁵ A.

⁶ 26.

⁷ σου>8*. 248; αὐτοῦ 23. 70. 72.

⁸ A.

⁹ omn.

¹⁰ Pr 24²⁸ (30⁵) Na 1⁷ Ze 3¹².

¹¹ ZAW., XXVI (1906), 290.

¹² Comp. the reading καὶ επαῖξεις ἐπ αὐτοὺς 44. 52. 55. 64. 71. 74. 106. 119. 121 (with the error -ξει / -ξεις). 123. 134. 144. 236. 242-246. Ald. Cat. Nic. A¹. ed 7; καὶ επαρεῖς ἐπ αὐτοὺς A; καὶ ἐὰν ἐπαγάγῃς (ἐπάγεις Compl.) ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς A.

¹³ A: καὶ ἐὰν θυμωθῇς ἐπ’ αὐτούς.

we must emend here likewise: καὶ ἐπάξεις αὐτοῖς or ἐπ' αὐτούς. The emendation is rendered plausible by the knowledge that in four other places that have come under my observation ἐπάξω has by its side the corrupt variant πατάξω.¹

The corrupt reading ἀπαχθησθησεσθαι n / ἀπάχθητε Ge 42¹⁶ finds its analogy in Is 16¹⁴ where αχθῆσθης² or αχθεσθεις³ is found for ἀχθῆς. The latter is of course the correct reading; the translator pointed תגלי (or תגלי, תגלי) / תגלי.

Is 28²⁰ του ημας συναχθῆναι is apparently corrupt. In the first place ημας BSAQ⁵ is itacistic error for υμας Γ⁶; but the whole is corrupt. The translator wrote του μη συναχθῆναι = Θ. With the aid of the emended text, we arrive at the reading מהתכנס / כהתכנס; (του) μη c. infin. = מן c. infin., as may be seen from such an example as μη ἐπαγαγεῖν = מעבר Is 54^{9,7} || Hence we are led to the conclusion that the translator with his του μη διαπορεύεσθαι μηδὲ ἀνακάμπτεν Za 9⁸ pointed his text מעבר ומשב / מעבר ומשב. || An then to the solution of a more difficult problem: I K 13⁶ μη προσάγειν αὐτόν is reducible to מנש for the received כּי נגשׁ. For the graphic variant כּי / מ I cannot quote another instance from my own observations; but undoubtedly examples will be found. On the other hand, I have met with a sufficient number of the (exegetical) misreading (misinterpretation) of ש into ש and vice versa, and in this very verb I am in a position to cite Is 53⁷ where both Θ προσήχθη and Σ προσηνέχθη presuppose נגשׁ for the Masoretic נגשׁ. The form נגשׁ for נגשׁת, which suggested itself to the translator, is no more impossible than נשא for נשאת, or נתן for נתת. || This observation leads to another find. Je 44 (37)¹² we read ἀγοράσαι / לָחֶלֶק. The consonants are supported by AΘ⁸ Σ⁹ 10 Σ¹¹ 12; just how the word was pointed by them, may still be a matter of doubt; at all events, they took it as a denominative from חֶלֶק. According to Giesebrecht, the ren-

¹ Le 26²⁵ (16. 73. 77); IV K 6¹⁹ (243); Je 22⁷ (106); 25¹³ (A). Conversely we find the corrupt επαξω B. 42 for the correct πατάξω rell Ez 22¹³ (Rothstein's retroversion והבאתי is thus rendered problematical).

² 93. ³ 62. 147 (bad orthography). The corrupt reading underlies 11. 12. ⁴ Comp. Am 7^{11, 17} Is 23¹ Je 47 (40)¹.

⁵ Also 24. 49. 51. 62. 106. 147. 306. 309. Compl. Hier.

⁶ = Sixt (and rell ex sil).

⁷ Activum pro passivo.

⁸ μερισθῆναι.

⁹ μερίσασθαι.

¹⁰ לפלגא אחסנתיה.

¹¹ 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.

¹² ut divideret possessionem.

dering of the Septuagint goes back to the same consonants and to the same interpretation. But, to say the least, that is by no means obvious. On the other hand, we find that ἀγοράζειν corresponds in two passages¹ to לָקַח, just as in five passages² it represents the synonymous קָנָה, while Ne 10³¹ ἀγορασμός = מָקַח. Hence it may be readily conjectured that the translator read in his text לָלַקַח / לָחַלַק, that is, the same consonants transposed, and that his grammar permitted him to see in the word the form לָקַח־לְ as a possible by-form of לָקַח־לְ.³

Da 11¹⁰ Θ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ συνάξουσιν ὄχλον ἀνα μέσον πολλῶν contains two corruptions: for ἀνα μέσον read with AA. alii δυνάμεων,⁴ and for συνάξουσιν read συνάψουσι καὶ συνάξουσιν. Note the variant συναψουσιν 88 for συναξουσιν, and the insertion of καὶ συναψουσι after πολλῶν in A. The whole is then = יִבְנוּ רִבִּים יִתְגַּדְּלוּ וְאֶסְפוּ הַמֶּן חֵילִים רַבִּים §; συνάπτειν sc. πόλεμον, comp. with the object expressed verse 24 Θ = הַתְּנִיחָה לַמַּלְחָמָה, De 2^{9.24} = הַתְּנִיחָה מַלְחָמָה and ibid. 5.19 = הַתְּנִיחָה. Apparently συνάψουσι was miswritten into συναξουσι, and then καὶ συνάξουσιν was omitted; συναψ— and συναξ— are proved as possible variants

¹ Ne 10³¹ and II Ch 1¹⁶; in the latter passage, במַחִיר is expressed by Α (ἐν ἀλλάγματι). Also Σ ψ 67(68)¹⁹ לָקַחַת is rendered لَحَاح.

² I Ch 21^{24bis} Si 37¹¹ Is 24²; AL. Ge 47¹⁹.

³ Observe that while ㄨㄣ supply an object denoting "portion, possession"—the "land of Benjamin" and chapter 32 are responsible for this curious bit of exegesis—, certain Greek manuscripts (x c. a mg Q mg Δ) rightly add ἄρτον, "to buy food", a most natural thing to do during the momentary raising of the siege. It is true, יִתְצַוּוּ Jb 40²⁵⁽³⁰⁾ is rendered by Θ ἀγοράσουσιν αὐτόν (against ㄨ μεριτεύονται δὲ αὐτόν, 'Α ἡμισεύσουσιν αὐτόν, Σ διαμερισθήσονται sive -θήσεται); as חָצָה and קָצָה are synonyms, it may still be possible to reduce ἀγοράσαι in Je to the received קָחַל. If so, that would be another illustration of the value of complete induction. But it remains difficult to see how חָצָה and ἀγοράζειν could be equivalent. Perhaps the Theodotionic rendering belongs to the first half of the verse (יָרָץ; comp. De 2⁶ where יָרָץ is rendered in ㄨ by λήμψεσθε || ἀγοράσατε = יָרָץ).—An interesting variant in the Je passage is ἀποδράσαι (239). Of course, it may be a corruption from ἀγοράσαι. On the other hand, it may represent the Masoretic קָחַל in the sense "to slip through, run away" (see Giesebrecht *ad locum*). (Another variant is παροικίαι 26 = ?)

⁴ δυνάμεις Q is corrupt, as it does not agree with πολλῶν; the abbreviated δυνάμεω (so A) was incorrectly resolved.

not only from the reading in codex 88 but also from De 32²³ 1 and IV K 5^{11,2}

II K 3²³ ηκουσαν A for Hebrew אָזַן is certainly suspicious; ᾠχθησαν B. rell is graphically somewhat distant. But an instance like Le 1¹⁰ αὐτου 54. 75 for αὐτό will suggest the possibility that ηκουσαν is a misheard ᾠκουσαν. Since ᾠκον is used as an aorist, the ending -οσαν for -ον, so frequently met with in the Greek of the Septuagint in aorists, becomes intelligible.³

κ and π are found interchanged in a number of instances. I have noted some in a previous paper.⁴ Observe the additional examples: Za 9⁴ καταξει⁵ / πατάξει⁶; ibid. 12⁴ καταξω⁷ / πατάξω.⁸

The meaningless καταταξετε w Ge 44²⁹ is due to ditto-graphed τα; the correct reading is of course κατάξετε = יהוררתם(ו). The same error occurs Ge 44³¹ 9 III K 3¹ 10 Am 3¹¹ 11 Jl 3(4)^{2,12} The next step is the simplex ταξετε¹³ (hence also without an intermediary Is 26⁵ 14); and, conversely, Je 19⁸ 15 Ez 44¹⁴ 16

How complete induction may be obtained. Whether the student of the Septuagint aims at restoring the Greek original as it left the translators' hands, or, more ultimately, at a recovery of the Semitic "Vorlage," he is always face to face with problems of identification. Whatever is isolated, depending upon a particular constellation, cannot of course be covered by a general rule. But all those facts which are general, conditioned by causes which may occur again and again, must be formulated as rules, and as such be placed at the service of students. The complete induction of the

¹ συναψω 58 / συνάξω rell.

² επισυναψει 247 / επισυνάξει 71. 119. 243.

³ Comp. Is 53⁸ ἤκει Qmg. 62. 90. 144. 147. 233. Clem-Rom. Just-Mar. Chrys as a synonymous variant for ᾠχθη rell.

⁴ ZAW., XXVI (1906), 88.

⁵ s* A Q^a. 36. 40. 42. 49. 62. 86. 95. 106. 147. 185. 311.

⁶ BSc a c. b. rell = חכה(ו) f. ⁷ s*. ⁸ rell = חכה f.

⁹ t*. ¹⁰ 247. ¹¹ 198. ¹² 62. 147.

¹³ Jl 3(4)² (311). ¹⁴ ταξεis 36 / κατάξεis rell.

¹⁵ καταξω B. rell / τάξω AGA = שמת(ו).

¹⁶ καταξουσιν BQ. rell / τάξουσιν A. 26. 42. 49. 90. 91. 106. 198. 238. 239. 306. Ald. = נחתי(ו), the intermediate καταταξουσιν is found in 62.

sum total of general, typical facts can be secured only by two methods of procedure which can be easily combined. On the one hand, each article in the Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Lexical equations.

Versions of the Old Testament, such as we possess in the Oxford publication, must be gone through for the purpose of establishing all *lexical* equations. It is obvious, following as it does from the nature of Semitic speech, that derivatives and compounds must be treated in conjunction with the primary words and the simplicia. It has been shown in this paper how the equation of ἐπάγειν τινί or ἐπί τινα = אָנִיךָ ב is substantiated by the equation ἐπαγωγή = עֲבָרָה. The Greek compounds often serve merely to mark the "Aktionsart".¹ Whether we say in Greek ἀναγγέλλειν, ἀπαγγέλλειν, or the simplex ἀγγέλλειν, the Semitic equivalents will in most cases be indifferently the same. Where, on the other hand, the preverb retains its local force, as in the case of ἄγειν, the Semitic equivalent will naturally differ, and the differences will become evident as the compounds are studied in their totality and with a view to each other.

On the other hand, the text of the versions must be investigated with a view to *Grammatical* equations. *Grammatical* equations. I use the two terms, *lexical* and *grammatical*, in their widest connotations. When I say, ἄγειν = נָהַג, I abstract from all grammatical differences, such as the correspondence of the active to the Kal, of the passive to the Semitic passive, of the aorist to the perfect, and the like. Equally, when I treat of the equations: aorist = perfect, ἔαν c. conjunct. aor. = אִם c. imperf., or of such stylistic peculiarities as "adjectivum pro nomine in genit.", or "activum pro passivo", I abstract from the lexical meaning of the words or phrases entering into consideration. While a modicum of grammatical observation is necessary for the proper grouping of lexical equations within each article, the material for a grammatical Concordance may be gathered direct from the texts. Complete induction, at all events, can be had only by means of the two lines of investigation, the

¹ See the lucid exposition by Moulton, *A Grammar of the New Testament Greek*, vol. i: Prolegomena, chapter vi.

lexical and the grammatical. It is a stupendous work, but it must be done: it is of utmost importance not only for purposes of textual criticism, but equally for a study of the oldest exegesis of Scriptures. And the results will have a decided bearing upon an understanding of the New Testament likewise which, in language and range of ideas, is linked to the Old Testament in the Hellenistic garb.